Oniscidia, which is properly credited to H. & A. Adams, 1853, could be ruled to be a misspelling of Oniscia Sowerby.

I thought it advisable to draw the Commission's attention to the fact that the elimination of *Oniscidia* H. & A. Adams, 1853, would not automatically solve the taxonomic problem, as E. A. Smith's *Oniscidia* of 1895 would also have to be taken into consideration.

### P. A. Maxwell and A. G. Beu (New Zealand Geological Survey, D.S.I.R., Lower Hutt, New Zealand)

We strongly support the application by Cernohorsky (1972, Bull. Zool. Nomencl., 19: 41-3) to have Oniscidia placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology. We agree with Cernohorsky's interpretation that H. and A. Adams (1853, Genera of Recent Mollusca, 1: 220) clearly differentiated the taxon from Morum Röding, 1798 (=Oniscia Sowerby, 1824; = Oniscidia Swainson, 1840, incorrect subsequent spelling of Oniscia Sowerby) and gave a good diagnosis and included a list of species that define the taxon exactly in the now current sense of Oniscidia = Cancellomorum Emerson and Old, 1963.

However, Dr. W. K. Emerson and Mr. Cernohorsky have pointed out to us Mörch's usage of "Oniscidia Sw[ainson]" a year earlier than that of H. and A. Adams. Mörch (1852, Catalogus Conchyliorum quae reliquit D. Alphonso D'Aguirra & Gadea Comes de Yoldi : 111) clearly set out Oniscidia as a subgenus discrete from Morum "Bolt." Röding, synonymised with Morum the names "Oniscia, Sow. Theliostoma Aut. Sow. Gen. Lambidium Link", included in Oniscidia the single species cancellata Sowerby, 1824 (type-species of Oniscidia as now currently used = Cancellomorum Emerson and Old) and included three species in Morum that define it as now currently used. Therefore we consider that Mörch regarded Oniscidia as a separate name and was using it for a taxon separate from Oniscia, and was not simply repeating Swainson's incorrect subsequent spelling. We consider that, despite Mörch's attributing it to "Sw[ainson]", Oniscidia should be treated in the same way as the many other brieflyintroduced generic names in his Yoldi catalogue, and be regarded as an available new name proposed in this work. At least one previous author (Olsson, 1931, Bull. Amer. Paleont., 17 (63): 94-96) attributed Oniscidia (consistently incorrectly spelled Oniscidea) to Mörch, although without citing a date or bibliographic reference; as far as we are aware he can have been referring only to Mörch's usage in the Yoldi catalogue.

Proposals of names to replace invalid usage of *Oniscidia* Swainson for this taxon have not found general acceptance, especially in Australasia, and we strongly urge the acceptance of *Oniscidia* Mörch, 1852 (type-species, by monotypy : *Oniscia cancellata* Sowerby, 1824) as the valid name for the taxon.

## COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF HYLA CRUCIALIS (AMPHIBIA). Z.N.(S.) 1982 (see volume 29, pages 39–40)

# By Ronald I. Crombie (National Zoological Park, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. 20009, U.S.A.)

Trueb's (1972) proposal for the conservation of *Hyla lichenata* (Gosse, 1851) and suppression of the overlooked senior synonym *Hyla crucialis* Harlan, 1826, is unconvincing. The use of the plenary powers to preserve the generally unfamiliar name of a poorly known species is of questionable necessity.

Bull. zool. Nomencl. Vol. 30, Part 1. July 1973.

There is no doubt that the names *Hyla crucialis* Harlan (1826 : 64), *H. lichenata* (Gosse 1851 : 362) and *H. anochloros* (Gosse 1851 : 364) all apply to the same species; I was aware of this when I first brought the problem to Dr. Trueb's attention in 1971. It cannot be denied that *H. lichenata* prevails in the literature. However, are any of the three names involved in "general current use"?

Declaration 43 (Bull. Zool. Nomencl., vol. 27, pts. 3/4, p. 135, Dec. 1970) states (paragraph iii) that, "mentioning of a name in a synonymy or its mere listing in an abstracting publication, or in a nomenclator or other index or list of names does not constitute publication in the sense of Article 23b,"<sup>1</sup> and later (paragraph iv) that, each" citation of a name is to be considered on its own merits regardless of the nature or the title of the work in which the name appears"<sup>2</sup>... The inference is that mere publication of a name without adding information does not constitute usage for the purposes of establishing a name in the literature. The West Indian herpetological literature is littered with cases of a single paper's being published in two or more journals, often without change. Faunal checklists and other papers containing no new information are also common. Under these criteria, most of the papers cited by Trueb to substantiate *H. lichenata's* entrenchment in the literature are invalidated. Barbour's papers (1930, 1935, 1937) are mere lists with no new data. Nieden (1923) is a translation of Boulenger (1882). Duellman (1960, 1970) and Taylor (1948) mention H. lichenata in passing in discussions of other groups of hylid frogs. Trueb's (1970) comments are speculatory as she had not examined a specimen of H. lichenata at that time. Tyler (1971) used lichenata although I had informed him of the existence of the Harlan name before publication.

Almost all recent authors have depended on the data provided by Dunn (1926, 1929) Only Lynn (1940), Lynn and Dent (1943), and Panton (1952) added small amounts of information on the species. The most recent review of Jamaican amphibians (Schwartz and Fowler, in press) used the name *Hyla crucialis* on the authority of a paper (Crombie, MS) I had written but delayed publishing pending the recommendations of the International Congress on the dispute over Article 23b (see Mayr *et al* 1971, Collette *et al* 1972, and Corliss 1972). Unfortunately, Dr. Trueb's proposal appeared before the issue could be resolved.

The name *Hyla lichenata* (Gosse) is not in current use as defined by the "five different authors in at least ten publications" criterion of the old Article 23b and the new, revised Article 79b. Furthermore, the name is unfamiliar to many herpetologists, even some working in the West Indies. The species remains known from less than two dozen specimens, many lacking locality data. This paucity of specimens is partly due to the secretive habits of the frog but primarily reflects the lack of work on Antillan hylids. The fact that Harlan's *Hyla crucialis*, published by a pioneer herpetologist in a well known journal, has remained overlooked for 145 years is ample evidence that West Indian tree frogs are a poorly studied group. Harlan's type specimen is still extant (Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia 2180), although it has been unrecognized as a type for many years.

The statute of limitations was instituted to protect well known names from replacment by obscure senior synonyms. To use this statute to suppress older names in poorly studied groups or names overlooked by careless early workers is inappropriate. Stability would not be best served by setting aside a valid senior synonym represented by a type specimen in favour of an infrequently used younger name with no type. As a concerned student of the ecology and systematics of West Indian hylid frogs, I disagree with Dr. Trueb's proposal. The case involves two trivial, poorly documented names and I see no reason why priority should not prevail. I recommend that *Hyla crucialis* Harlan, 1826, be used instead of its junior synonym *Hyla lichenata* (Gosse, 1851) as the name of the large Jamaican tree frog.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The substance of this provision is now embodied in Art. 79 (b) (i) of the Code, see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 29: 186, 1972. R.V.M.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>This provision appears as Art. 79 (b) (ii) of the Code. R.V.M.

# REFERENCES

BARBOUR, T. 1930. A list of Antillean reptiles and amphibians. Zoologica 11 (4): 61-116.

BARBOUR, T. 1935. A second list of Antillean reptiles and amphibians. Ibid. 19 (3): 77-141. BARBOUR, T. 1937. Third list of Antillean reptiles and amphibians. Bull. Mus.

Comp. Zool. 82 (2): 77-166.

BOULENGER, G. A. 1882. Catalogue of the Batrachia Salientia s. Ecaudata in the collection of the British Museum. 2nd. Ed. London, xvi + 503 pp.

COLLETTE, B. B., D. M. COHEN and J. A. PETERS. 1972. Stability in zoological nomenclature. Science 177: 452-453.

CORLISS, J. O. 1972. Priority and stability in zoological nomenclature: Resolution of the problem of Article 23b at the Monaco Congress. Science 177: 1120.

CROMBIE, R. I. MS. The ecology and systematics of Jamaican hylid frogs.

DUELLMAN, W. E. 1960. Redescription of Hyla valancifer. Studies of American hylid frogs. III. Herpetologica 16 (1): 55-57.

DUELLMAN, W. E. 1970. The hylid frogs of Middle America. Monogr. Mus. Nat. Hist., Univ. Kansas, 1, xi + 753 pp

DUNN, E. R. 1926. The frogs of Jamaica. Proc. Boston Soc. Nat. Hist. 38 (4): 111-130.

DUNN, E. R. 1929. On the trail of the snorer. Nature 13 (2): 110-112. GOSSE, P. H. 1851. A naturalist's sojourn in Jamaica. Longman's Brown, Green, and Longman's, London, v-xxvi + 508 pp.

HARLAN, R. 1826. A new species of Hyla. American Journ. Sci. Arts 10: 64-65. LYNN, W. G. 1940. I. Amphibians. In Lynn, W. G. and C. Grant, The herpetology

of Jamaica. Bull. Inst. Jamaica, Sci. Ser., no. 1:1-148 (1-60).

LYNN, W. G. and J. N. DENT. 1943. Notes on Jamaican amphibians. Copeia 1943 (4): 234-242.

MAYR, E., G. G. SIMPSON, and E. EISENMANN. 1971. Stability in zoological nomenclature. Science 174 : 1041-1042.

NIEDEN, F. 1923. Anura I. Subordo Aglossa and Phaneroglossa, Sectio. 1, Arcifera. Das Tierreich, Lief. 46, Berlin, i-xxxii + 584 pp.

PANTON, E. S. 1952. Our ground and tree frogs-Glimpses into their life and habits. Nat. Hist. Notes Nat. Hist. Soc. Jamaica 5 (53): 87-92 + 94.

SCHWARTZ, A. and D. C. FOWLER. In press. The Anura of Jamaica: A progress report.
Stud. Fauna Curaçao and other Carib. Islands.
TAYLOR, E. H. 1948. Two new hylid frogs from Costa Rica. Copeia 1948 (4):

233-238.

TRUEB, L. 1970. The evolutionary relationships of casque-headed treefrogs with co-ossified skulls (family Hylidae). Univ. Kansas Publ., Mus. Nat. Hist. 18: 547-716.

TRUEB, L. 1972. Hyla crucialis Harlan, 1826 (Amphibia) : Proposed suppression under plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 1982, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 29 (1): 39-40.

TYLER, M. J. 1971. The phylogenetic significance of vocal sac structure in hylid frogs. Univ. Kansas Publ., Mus. Nat. Hist. 19: 319-360.

## ADDENDUM TO THE PROPOSAL THAT THE GENUS NAME TEUTHIS LINNAEUS (PISCES) BE SUPPRESSED. Z.N.(S.) 1721

## By D. J. Woodland (Department of Zoology, University of New England, Armidale, N.S.W., 2351, Australia)

This comment relates to proposals before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the generic name Siganus Forsskål, 1775 and Teuthis Linnaeus, 1766 (Nielsen & Klausewitz Bull. zool. Nomencl. 25 : 16, Taylor Bull. zool.

Bull. zool. Nomencl., Vol. 30, Part 1. July 1973.



Crombie, Ronald I. 1973. "Comment on the proposed suppression of Hyla crucialis (Amphibia). Z. N. (S.) 1982." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 30, 4–6. <u>https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.6384</u>.

View This Item Online: <a href="https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44472">https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.6384</a> Permalink: <a href="https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/6384">https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/6384</a>

**Holding Institution** Natural History Museum Library, London

**Sponsored by** Natural History Museum Library, London

**Copyright & Reuse** Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder. Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature License: <u>http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/</u>

Rights: <a href="https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions">https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions</a>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org.